



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

appreciate and enjoy the message that the Romans have left to the world, and all without once thinking of a bicycle.

Whether Latin can be used as a business *lingua franca*, as it once was, having words for bicycles amongst other things, is a different question, to be judged on its own merits. If it should be so used, its style would be to the scholar's Latin very much what business English is to the cultivated man's English; and no teacher would dream of using it in his teaching, any more than he would use the language of the invoice or the advertisement in an English essay or poem.

The Direct Method in language teaching is liable to abuse, but it is not reasonable to assume that an abuse is the method, especially if it cannot be shown that the abuse is practised by those who practise the method. This abuse is not practised by anyone known to me who practises the Direct Method. And it should be noted that the Direct Method for Modern Languages is no longer on trial: as a principle, it is now taken for granted by all who know the facts, and the points at issue are, how far it is useful to assist it by formal grammar and translation. On these points there is a difference of opinion which decreases as experience is collected and used.

I believe that the real cause of most of the opposition we meet is, that teachers unconsciously shrink from the trouble of change. This is very natural, and it is troublesome to change; but any trouble is worth taking if it will improve our work. This particular change is like the change from slavery to freedom or from night to day; and I can assure Mrs. Peck and any who have her misgivings that the daylight will banish that nightmare bicycle.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

PERSE SCHOOL, Cambridge, England.

### ROGER ASCHAM ON THE DIRECT METHOD

Advocates of the Direct Method deny every implication of faddism and novelty by citing the familiar words of Comenius (1592-1670): *Omnis lingua usu potius discitur quam praeceptis, id est audiendo, legendo, relegendo, imitationem manu et lingua temptando.*

It is interesting to note, however, that there were divergent views on the subject among classicists of the period. Good old Roger Ascham, in his quaint and learned *Scholemaster* (1570), openly condemns the *viva voce* use of Latin in vogue in certain quarters of England:

"Yet all men couet to haue their children fpeake latin: and so do I verie earnestlie too. We bothe, haue one purpofe: we agree in desire, we with one end: but we differ fomewhat in order and waie, that leadeth rightlie to that end. Other would haue them fpeake at all aduentures: and, so they be fpeakinge, to fpeake, the Master careth not, the Scholer knoweth not, what. This is, to feeme, and not to bee. . . I wifh to haue them fpeake fo, as it may well appeare, that the braine doth gouerne the tonge, and that reason leadeth forth the taulke. . . For, good vnderstanding muft first be bred in the childe, which, being nurifhed with fkill, and vfe of writing . . . is the onelie waie to bring him to iudgement and readineffe in fpeaking: and that in farre fhorter time . . . than he shall do, by common teachyng of the common fcholes in England".

In the second book he returns to the attack upon "learning without a booke", as he characterizes the *viva voce* or Direct Method. I quote again his quaint but forceful English (the Italics are mine):

"I remember, whan I was yong, in the North, they went to the Grammar fchole, litle children: they came from thence great lubbers: alwayes learning, and litle profitng: learning without booke, euery thing, vnderftandyng with in the booke, litle or nothing. *Their whole knowledge, by learning without the booke, was tied onelie to their tong and lips, and neuer afcended vp to the braine and head, and therefore was fone fpitte out of the mouth againe*".

The chief defects of the Direct Method as advocated today seem to be as follows:

(1) Through its scope for motor-activity as well as its appeal largely through objective stimuli it is virtually restricted to comparatively young pupils.

(2) It fails to distinguish between a literary language like classical Latin and Greek and a living or spoken language like French.

(3) It largely divorces the study of Latin and English by minimizing the importance of oral and written translation, in an attempt to make the pupil think directly through the medium of the Latin. It thus defeats one of the main aims of Latin in the modern High School curriculum, i.e. to awaken the linguistic consciousness of the student by furnishing him a foundation for the formal study of grammar. Word-derivation, the logical analysis of sentence-structure, together with the subtle distinctions in word-order and emphasis required in translation, make it a fine art as well as an invaluable training for every student. It should at least be something more than an incident, a 'by-product', so to speak, of Latin teaching.

NORMAN E. HENRY.

PEABODY HIGH SCHOOL, Pittsburgh, Pa.

In *The School Review* for January, 1913 (21.67-69), Professor C. J. Cipriani, of the University of Chicago, in a review of a book entitled *Short Stories for Oral French*, by Anna W. Ballard, says (the Italics are mine):

"The very commendable purpose of the book greatly overshadows in interest the merit of the book itself, *since the reform method is almost new in this country*, and its successful introduction would most assuredly mean a step in advance on the road of educational progress. But just here, perhaps, a word of caution may be in order. Not until experiments in progressive education are attended with the scientific thoroughness and preparation that attend, e.g. the experiments in progressive agriculture, will they give lasting and conclusive results. The reform method, so successfully used in Germany (and some other European) schools, presupposes for this success conditions that do not generally obtain in American schools, some, indeed, that are actually 'antagonistic' to the usual methods employed there".

Professor Cipriani then points out that, by the method prescribed by Miss Ballard for the use of her book, most of the work would be done in the class-room. By her system, as by the system in use in Germany, the average amount of time "profitably devoted" to preparation for each recitation period would not exceed half an hour. He then says:

"The American school-system, on the contrary, presupposes, for each forty or forty-five minute

recitation of a college preparatory unit, one hour and a quarter or one hour and a half outside preparation, nor can the required amount of 'reading' (from 100-175 pages the first year) be 'covered' unless the whole of this time is completely and profitably utilized. In other words, in German schools 'the burden of learning' is laid principally on the class-room work, done under the direction of the teacher; in American schools it is laid principally on the preparation period, in the teacher's absence, and this period, in theory at least, is almost double the class-room period. . . .

The American teacher, who, without a careful analysis of the situation, attempts to introduce the German method of teaching into American conditions may be greatly disappointed, because much of the time specifically allotted to the outside preparation is voluntarily relinquished, and this loss is not always sufficiently offset by the better method of class-room instruction. The result, then, is that the blame that should fall on the working-conditions is laid on the method itself, and ultimate progress is really rather retarded than advanced by such sporadic experiments". C. K.

The following extract comes from an article entitled *Utility and Discipline*, which appeared in *The Nation* for January 23, 1913:

Complaints of poor results in the teaching of modern languages, in American schools and colleges, have long been common and continue to make themselves heard. It is something of a novelty, however, to encounter them in the land where we have often been told such teaching is done to perfection. In France there is just now no small stir about the subject. At the very moment when the French Government is completing an arrangement with the Italian for the exchange of teachers of modern languages in secondary schools—whereby both the French master would teach his language to Italian pupils, and the Italian master to French, by the "direct method"—the success of the whole plan is called seriously in question. The fear is expressed that the ordinary student is getting neither a working command of the foreign language he is studying, nor the benefits of intellectual discipline.

The subject is handled vigorously by a recent article in the *Revue des Langues Vivantes*. The writer is one of the examiners for the Degree of Bachelor of Letters, and sets forth particularly his experience in dealing with papers and essays offered in German. His report is pretty depressing. Except in a few cases, the work he declares to be "lamentable", and "the progress achieved is insignificant, puerile, or, in fact, non-existent". Not so good a knowledge of German grammar is displayed as is shown of Latin by candidates in the Classics. This examiner writes:

"For my own part, I have more than once in recent years been painfully surprised to find that young candidates for the degree manifested an inconceivable ignorance. They appeared to be confronted with wonderful discoveries when they are told that there is a declension of adjectives in German, according to strict rules, or when they are informed that the German relative pronoun—a decidedly treacherous part of speech, they think—has a syntax of its own". C. K.

Elsewhere in this issue Professor Davidsen, of Cornell University, quotes with approval the support which the Department of Education in New York State is giving to the Direct Method. Im-

portant light is thrown on Professor Davidsen's words by a paper by Mr. William R. Price, State Inspector of Modern Languages, Albany, New York, entitled *The Second Year of a Modern Language* (see *The School Review* for January, 21:26-38). In view of Professor Purin's advocacy of the inductive study of grammar in a two-year German course and Mr. Krause's enthusiastic reference in *Educational Review* (January, 1912) to the appointment of such an Inspector in New York State I find the following passage of great interest (26-27: Mr. Price is throughout concerned in fact only with German):

"Perhaps I ought to say a few words to you about the first year's work. . . . There should be no attempt to imitate the European reformers, with their pre-grammatical stage, where no grammar is taught, nor yet in their inductive, or rather pseudo-inductive teaching of the grammar. That sort of thing is well enough in German and French schools, where conditions make it advisable and insure its successful operation; it is, however, quite out of place in our short courses and under our peculiar conditions. What we want is a time-saver, and not a time-waster; and of all the spendthrifts the so-called inductive method is the worst. Where it can and should be used is in the second and third year, rather than in the first, after the fundamentals have been mastered; for the use of the inductive method is, strictly speaking, the province of the scholar rather than of the learner. What we wish, in our first-year course, is the speediest and most solid preparation for the reading of French and German; and for that, pronunciation, knowledge of forms, a fair vocabulary, and some notion of syntax are quite necessary. Where the great majority of our pupils take but two years of a modern language it seems to me little short of criminal to dawdle over the work in a pre-grammatical, propaedeutical, or pseudo-inductive course".

Evidently this State Inspector of Modern Languages in a State which is lending its support to the Direct Method is against the use of the Direct Method in the first year; yet it is precisely in the first year that those who seek to apply the method to Latin expect to find the greatest value of the method. On page 30 Mr. Price writes as follows:

"I believe the following statements to be absolutely true for modern language-teaching in American schools under existing conditions:

"First: With the direct method, pure and simple, without translation, we shall get nowhere, at least nowhere worth going.

"Second: There will be little or no time for oral work (oral reading and conversation) if the daily reading-lesson is to be translated in the class-room; therefore

"Third: We must banish from the class-room, but not from the course, translation into English (which can just as well be done at home), and keep for the class-room the oral work (oral reading and conversation), which can not be done at home".

On pages 31-37 are valuable suggestions concerning the right use of the Direct Method in Modern Language teaching—always, be it remembered, Mr. Price had in mind the second year. He is particularly vigorous in his discussion of the right sort of talking in the foreign language by the teacher. In his concluding paragraphs he says some things which should be laid to heart by every one who thinks of employing the Direct Method in the teaching of Latin (37-38). C. K.